

STATEMENT OF SENATOR STROM THURMOND (D-SC) WITH REFERENCE TO THE PETITION FOR CLOTURE UNDER SECTION 22 OF THE SENATE RULES, MARCH 10, 1960.

Mr. President, it is my sincere hope that the Senate will decline to apply cloture.

The Senate should be conscious of the fact that the present debate is concerned not with legislation which has reached the floor of the Senate by the normal and usual legislative process. The proposals--and they are many--were not reported to the Senate as a result of the deliberation of one of the standing legislative committees of the Senate. The amendments which lie at the desk have not, as is the usual procedure, been printed for a long period of time and available for the study of the members of this body. These proposals, on the contrary, have accumulated day by day over the past few weeks of this debate.

There has been reference to the fact that the debate on the proposals has proceeded for several weeks. As a matter of fact, however, Mr. President, some of the amendments to the Dirksen substitute were offered as late as this week. While it may be said that most of them deal generally with subjects which have been under discussion during this debate, it should be pointed out that the amendments are complex and, for the most part, couched in general language and apparently capable of the broadest applicability. Although most of those who have participated to the greatest extent in this debate have done their utmost to analyze these proposals under the unusual and disturbing circumstances which have prevailed, many of the proposed amendments have hardly been mentioned in the debate thus far.



In some instances, numerous amendments which apparently have the same general purpose have been offered by several different Senators and, in some instances, more than one amendment has been offered by the same Senator dealing with the same subject and with the same apparent purpose, but couched in different language. A study of the record of this debate fails to reveal even an explanation of this shotgun approach. Under these circumstances, could anyone reason that debate should now be shut off and Senators precluded from discussing the multiplicity of amendments which are pending?

On Tuesday of this week, that is, the day before yesterday, two additional amendments were offered. The first, offered by the Senator from South Dakota, appears to be substantially the same as the portion of Part Three of the bill which was passed by the House of Representatives in 1957, and which portion was stricken from the bill before it was enacted. There are several other proposals at the desk of apparently similar purpose, but phrased in different terminology, and therefore of different effect and applicability. Also offered the day before yesterday is an amendment by the Senator from Idaho, which is seven pages long, and which would replace Section 7 of the proposed substitute to which the cloture motion is addressed. This amendment is another version of an idea which was advanced by the Attorney General for the first time only a few weeks ago. Quite probably, it is an improvement on Section 7 of the Dirksen proposal. Nevertheless, however, there has been no debate either on the Case or the Church amendments. Yet should cloture be imposed on the Senate, both of these proposals, along with the innumerable other amendments, would be included within the limitation of debate.



It is tragic that the circumstances surrounding the debate which has thus far taken place on this subject have been such as to make it extremely difficult and indeed impossible for all Senators to be present for the entirety of the debate. Under these circumstances, an even greater amount of debate is necessary than would have been the case had we been proceeding during regular daylight hours, when Senators could have attended and reaped the benefits and pearls of wisdom which have been emitted with regard to a few of the ever-growing number of amendments at the desk. Apparently, attendance in the Senate, even during the usual hours during which the Senate meets, has suffered from the abnormal procedure to which the Senate committed itself.

I implore the Senate, therefore, to defeat this proposal for ending debate and thereafter, proceeding in an orderly fashion during normal hours, to continue the debate in an effort to consider objectively the wealth of information which remains to be given concerning the mushrooming number of amendments at the desk.